

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

May 23, 2001

DoubleTree Hotel
Pasco, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| William Ruckelshaus, Chair | Seattle |
| Larry Cassidy | Vancouver |
| Brenda McMurray | Yakima |
| James Peters | Olympia |
| Steve Meyer | Executive Director, Conservation Commission |
| Tim Smith | Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| Craig Partridge | Designee, Department of Natural Resources |
| Joe Williams | Designee, Department of Ecology |

Call to Order

Chair Ruckelshaus called the meeting to order at 8:20 a.m.

Since there were not enough Board members present to meet the quorum, the Board started the meeting with management reports.

Topic #2: Management and Status Reports

Director's Report: Director Johnson showed the Board an example of a closed project report that will be used for various reporting documents and posting on the web page. This will be a one-page sheet that contains preliminary project results along with a map and picture of the project. It is still in draft form if Board members have suggestions for changes.

Staff received a dedication ceremony announcement for one of the salmon projects that has been completed in the last year (Seaboard Estuary SRFB Project #99-1694). \$225,000 of salmon recovery funds were used for this project. (Note: Chair Ruckelshaus was later invited to speak at this dedication ceremony and was able to promote the use of salmon recovery funds for projects such as the Seaboard Lumber project.) Director Johnson also reminded the Board that the June SRFB meeting tour on Friday, June 15, will include viewing this project.

Seattle City Light has developed a promotional aid that includes a photosensitive sheet in an envelope containing a salmon picture. The salmon photo disappears if exposed to the light unless properly handled. This is a unique way to show the public ways to protect our salmon resources.

Another example of salmon-related public education and the arts is the city of Olympia's contract with various artists to decorate salmon sculptures. The city purchased eight of the forms to place around Olympia. One or two of the decorated salmon will travel with the Lakefair float to parades around the state.

Director Johnson gave an overview of the Third Round grant process and what needs to be done before the applications can be released. Today the Board will review the forms, changes will be made before the June meeting, and the forms will need to be adopted in June to make the July 2 deadline. The project applications are then due to the SRFB on November 30 with decision meeting in April of 2002.

The Chair noted that these are important documents and that now is the time for Board members to speak up if they would like changes made before the documents are final.

The Chair introduced Joe Williams, the new SRFB representative for the Department of Ecology.

(Member Larry Cassidy arrived.)

Financial Management Services Report: Debra Wilhelmi updated the Board on current budget status and future budget projections. (See notebook for details.) She also noted May 24th is the last day of the first special session. It is still unknown how the budget will look when it is finally adopted.

Brenda McMurray asked if there is other money budgeted for salmon projects. Response: Not really, there is other salmon money but it is for other types of projects and more agency-specific activities. The Department of Transportation may have project money for culverts. Department of Ecology also has gotten some money for water related activities related to fish.

Discussion followed on how the budget could impact the Board.

Larry Cassidy asked about the SSHEAR program and budget for this activity after the programmatic funding is spent. Tim Smith answered that full funding (\$3.4 million) is not in any of the proposed budgets although the base amount (\$1.7 million) is in the Department of Fish and Wildlife's budget request. This shortfall will cause the program to change. The Department plans to revamp the program and narrow the scope.

Topic #1: Review and Approval of the April SRFB Meeting Minutes

Brenda McMurray **moved** to approve the April SRFB meeting minutes as presented. Larry Cassidy **seconded** the motion. Minutes were **approved** as presented.

Continued Topic #2: Management Reports

Legislative Report: Jim Fox reported on legislative actions. (See notebook for details)

Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee: Jim discussed the Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee (JLARC) report. This will have some impacts on the SRFB and staff has already begun looking at what will need to be done to meet the requirements in this

report. One requirement is development of focused performance measures with direction coming from the Office of Financial Management (OFM). The Chair asked what would happen if the Board disagrees with the recommendations presented by the JLARC report? Who is the final arbitrator on this report? Jim answered that it is up to the agencies and that the performance measures are closely related to the monitoring strategy which will address many of the same issues. The requirement is a report to the legislature and that OFM will be coordinating the final report but each agency will develop its own performance measures and other pieces of the report. The SRFB has many of the recommended policies in place already and probably won't have too much trouble meeting the requirements. The Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) side of the agency may have a more difficult time with this since they may need statutory changes to meet the requirements.

Data Coordinator: Members inquired about the budget for the Salmon Recovery Data Coordinator position. Mr. Fox is fairly confident a base amount of funding will be provided but not as confident that there will be money budgeted for the project grants.

Larry Cassidy noted that the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) is also looking into data coordination and is contracting with an independent contractor to perform an assessment of all the data processes going on around the state and region (Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana). Mr. Cassidy noted NWPPC's Brian Walsh is working with Lynn Singleton.

Brenda McMurray discussed what a big project this is and how the Board needs to do all they can to make sure there is money available for the data coordination project. The Board also needs to include NMFS.

Joe Williams discussed Ecology's support of the data coordination work Lynn Singleton is doing.

Monitoring Activities: Jim Fox noted that the monitoring efforts will also encompass data needs. The Board discussed the need for data and how hard it is to get data for some of the basic information needs. We will probably never get to one unified data set but we could get common data fields and language.

Lead Entity Capacity: The pending legislation that includes the lead entity core budget also puts a cap on the number of lead entities that WDFW would be able to fund. Members discussed lead entity support and budget. The Board talked about the need for enhanced capacity, noting the Senate and Governor's budgets do not include money for enhancement.

Larry Cassidy mentioned that the Power Planning Council is looking at each state having its own planning system and he would like to have them use the lead entity process in Washington State. Bonneville has money budgeted to help fund this process. This funding would be at a regional level such as the Lower Columbia, Upper Columbia, Snake, and others. Hopefully, the lead entities are not breaking down into smaller units but rolling up into regional units.

Project Management Update: Rollie Geppert presented the project management update. (See notebook for details.) Excluding projects funded in the Second Round grant cycle, over 30% of projects have been completed.

Brenda McMurray asked about completed project follow-up review. Rollie said there is not a system in place although staff is working on how best to follow-up projects in the long term.

The Board continued discussion on the monitoring strategy and project follow-up compliance. Ms. McMurray doesn't think we should wait for the statewide monitoring strategy but to start to put procedures in place now.

Topic #3: Conditioned Projects

Director Johnson introduced this topic. (See notebook for details.)

Steve Meyer discussed the various conditions and how the sub-committee worked through these projects.

The Chair asked how the nearshore projects under Topic #6 matched with the conditioned nearshore projects. Jim Fox clarified the differences between the conditioned projects and the Corps proposal.

Staff will need to make sure the conditioned projects gather data in a way that is useful to the Corps project.

Joe Williams asked if the money used to fund these nearshore projects could be used for match money for the Corps project? Response: yes there is a possibility of this but need to check on whether the money is state or federal. To be used as match money it will need to be state funds.

The Board would like to condition the funding of the nearshore to coordinate with the Corps project. The Board would like a written report back from the projects explaining how they will coordinate with the Corps project.

Jim Peters will recuse himself from voting on this issue since the Tribe is the sponsor for the one of the projects under this proposal.

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt Resolution #2001-07. Larry Cassidy **seconded** the motion. Resolution #2001-07 was **approved**.

Topic #4: Monitoring Strategy

Jim Fox introduced this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

The legislature has passed Substitute Senate Bill 5637. This bill assigns the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) director and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) chair to co-chair the development of a monitoring plan covering both watershed health and salmon recovery. There is a very short period of time to complete this project

(eighteen months). There is an oversight committee created to help guide the development of this plan. They are expected to produce a product that is based on good policy as well as science. A small group of staff from SRFB and GSRO are laying out the workplan. They have also advertised for a project manager to manage this project. So far staff has met with NMFS and the state of Oregon to start coordination of this project. Staff will also meet with the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC). Lynn Singleton is coordinating data elements for the project. The first meeting of the oversight committee will be in June or July.

Mr. Ruckelshaus reported that everyone is working together on this project including the Independent Science Panel, legislature, and state agencies. So far, it is all working the way it is supposed to.

Jim Peters feels this is a good start and he is glad it is progressing. He asked how many people will be on the oversight committee? Mr. Ruckelshaus said he is encouraging as many members as possible. Jim Peters asked why the Department of Agriculture was not included on the list? Jim Fox didn't know why they were left out, but if it is decided they are important to the process, they will be included. Director Johnson noted that the Joint Natural Resource Cabinet (JNRC) is the basically the same group as the oversight committee. Perhaps that group will change its current direction and take this on as its next major issue.

Jim Fox reported that besides the oversight committee, there will be a number of groups looking at technical and policy issues. Individuals with expertise will be asked to join these smaller work groups. There will be lots of opportunity for people to be involved.

Topic #5: GSRO Report

Chris Drivdahl introduced this portion of the meeting. (See notebook for details.)

The focus of Chris' report was on the new *Guidance on Watershed Assessment for Salmon* recently released by the JNRC. The GSRO is asking the Board to consider how it can use this *Guidance* in upcoming grant cycles.

Steve Leider gave an update on the Assessment plan.

Steve has met with the lead entity advisory group (LEAG), the planning advisory group, the Joint Cabinet, and NMFS to discuss this guidance. The GSRO is looking for comments from the Board on areas in the guidelines that need more work.

The Chair commended the GSRO on the work that has been done. The Chair also noted that the request to use this document in upcoming grant cycles is something the Board should accommodate. Staff needs to work with LEAG to figure how best to use this document in the next grant cycle and then in future cycles.

Chris Drivdahl noted that, through the Joint Cabinet, all state agencies are supposed to be using this guidance in their permitting, granting, and project management.

Larry Cassidy asked what happens if a lead entity ranks projects that do not fall under this guidance? Mr. Ruckelshaus replied that the Board has always pressed to have the best projects funded by using an assessment strategy. This does provide guidance to the lead entities for choosing projects and ranking projects. Craig Partridge noted that this is not a cookbook for ranking and choosing projects but a thought process to help get the best projects.

Jim Peters asked whether this document is this still draft or is it final? Steve Leider's responded that it is a final product.

Jim Kramer noted that staff has been involved in critiquing this document. Text has been revised to coordinate with what the Board has done in the past and to match the Board's definitions. The way the Board currently funds assessments does not match with the *Guidance*. The Board will need to decide to whether to fund assessments in the next cycle or not.

Joe Williams explained how Ecology has been using this document to date and how the agency will use it in the future. Ecology has implemented this process in the Snohomish WRIA. Joe doesn't remember the exact cost but knows it was expensive. Joe stated that he would be happy to help work on the answer to any questions the Board may have.

Steve Leider informed the Board that the GSRO is continuing to work on making this document more usable and helpful.

The Chair thanked Steve for the good work on this document.

Topic #6: Nearshore Program Support - Update

Jim Fox introduced this topic with Tim Smith providing additional information on the Corps project. (See notebook for details.)

This is not a decision topic but a request for a block of time on the June agenda to present the final project scope of work and cost for Board approval and funding.

Jim Peters asked about the responsibility of the Corps to fund this project on its own. Tim Smith responded that the Corps has \$750,000 set aside for the first phase of this project but the funding requires a 50/50 match.

Mr. Smith will come back at the June SRFB meeting with the sponsor agreement, Scope of Work, governance structure, and the funding framework and request for the Board.

Jim Fox then discussed the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program Habitat Assessment. This is a three-phase assessment covering three separate sections of the Columbia River. The first phase of this three-phase project has been completed. The second phase has been presented to the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) for funding consideration. The group would like Washington to fund the third phase of this assessment work. OWEB has some concerns with funding its portion of

the assessment and also had some issues with the amount of funding they would have available. Jim Fox has asked Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB) to have its technical group review the third phase of this proposal and decide if it is a project that they would endorse for funding by the SRFB. The LCFRB did look at this three phase project and decided that the last third is the least important of the three sections because very little important habitat is in this section and what is there has been covered in earlier assessments of chum habitat. The phase two portion is more important. This group would recommend not funding the third phase but possibly splitting the funding of the second phase with OWEB. Jim Fox has also given this proposal to the SRFB's technical panel for review but has not heard back from them yet. If they also recommend funding of a portion of this proposal, the request will be brought back to the Board at a later meeting.

Topic #7: Review "Mission and Scope" Document (Board's Strategy)

Jim Kramer introduced this topic along with Jim Fox. (See notebook for details.)

This is a revision/update of the Board's January 2000, mission and scoping document. Today is a discussion only with a request for adoption being presented at the June SRFB meeting.

Jim Kramer went through the first portion of the document. Most of this portion of the document is a reorganization of the original document and the policies the Board has been working under since its beginning.

Section III. – Roles and Responsibilities:

Salmon Recovery Funding Board – partnerships

- The Chair would like to include lead entities in the wording when talking about partnerships that the Board will be working with.

Lead Entities

- Tim Smith would like to change the wording on line three paragraph three from 'administrative' grants to 'operational' grants.

Section IV. Overall SRFB Strategy to Support Salmon Recovery

Recovery Goals

- Brenda McMurray would like to have the goals include recovery of abundant and productive habitat since it may be a long time before the fish numbers increase and the habitat will need to be productive and functioning before that can happen. Not only having goals for the fish but also an interim goal of what has been done to improve habitat for the fish.

Science-based Decisions

- The Chair would like to include information on how the technical review panel will work with the lead entities both before the lists are prioritized and after.
- Tim Smith would like parallel information on how the community-based decisions are included along with the science-based decisions.
- Larry Cassidy mentioned a letter from Governor requesting regionalization of funding preferences and asked if the Board needs to work this into the document.

(Regionalization is mentioned on page 3 and under Principle 7 but can make this clearer and more implicit throughout the document.)

Jim Fox reviewed the rest of the document starting with Section V. Jim also reviewed the organization of this document. The Chair reminded the Board how important this document is since it is the Board's strategy.

Joe Williams also asked to have more detail on Ecology's watershed planning process in this document, possibly as part of the comprehensive approach. The Chair agreed, and also asked staff to make sure other activities like the watershed planning process and the work the NWPPC is doing within the subbasins are referenced.

Section V. The SRFB Funding Strategy

A. Guiding Principles

Principle #4: Steve Meyer – this section does not clearly recognize what the lead entities should do if the projects are not especially well supported by the community and what would happen with failure to act. This may need to be a new principle (failure to act).

Brenda McMurray also asked about needing another principle to include other outside influences such as the Shoreline Management Act and other broader community needs and failure if projects aren't completed.

Principle #5: Chair – Suggested references to the Independent Science Panel (ISP) should be clarified to say the Board supports the Independent Science Panel's work and guidance, not that the Board is doing this because the ISP said to.

Principle #7: – The Chair asked whether this paragraph indicates that the Board isn't going to do any cross-watershed projects until all the information is gathered? Should this be changed?

Larry Cassidy asked what the definition of Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) recovery goals are and where the Board will get these goals? Do not want to have the wrong goals to go strive for. Jim Kramer explained what the Technical Recovery Team (TRT) is working on to get to definitions of ESU recovery goals. These goals will include abundance, productivity, and diversity of population criteria. These goals will include habitat as well as harvest and hatchery concerns.

Principle #9: – Chair asked to include NMFS in this principle on improving the funding process because of its permitting role in the SRFB projects.

B. SRFB Funding Policies

1. Fish and Habitat Benefits.

The chair pointed out the first part of this policy notes cost benefit analysis and the last bullet talks about the cost effectiveness test. These are two different things and only one is mentioned in the introductory paragraph. Cost effectiveness is just as important to the lead entities as it is to the Board and the Board may want to talk to the lead entities about how to define the cost effectiveness in one area versus another area of the state.

2. ESA Listed Fish.

Larry Cassidy asked for clarification on the Board's approach. Does it really want to fund projects concerning listed fish? The Chair suggested adding the statement "While we fund projects that involve non-listed fish." Since the Board does fund projects that fall into this category, it would show a preference to projects with listed species present.

3. Naturally Spawning Fish.

Does the Board want to focus on naturally spawning fish or wild fish? How does the Board want to do this? Members had an extended discussion on the differences between naturally spawning and wild fish. It was suggested the Board preface the paragraph with the statement "that the Board strives to fund listed fish" as well as non-listed fish that may be in trouble. Department of Fish and Wildlife staff will work with SRFB staff to find options for wording of this policy and bring it back to the Board for the final policy decision.

4. Protection of Intact Habitat.

Craig Partridge suggested new wording for this policy:

Add sentence to 1st sentence: "In fact, protection of habitat processes is critical to the long term success of restoration actions."

Change last sentence to read: "The Board recognizes, however, that habitat restoration will also be necessary to achieve salmon recovery. Where lead entity habitat recovery strategies identify restoration actions primarily as a means to build community support for all actions necessary for salmon recovery, the Board may temporarily recognize that priority." Staff will incorporate discussed changes as well as include related changes in policy five.

7. Assessments.

Chair would like to look at the Governor's *Guidance on Watershed Assessment* and make sure what the Board is saying matches with this document. Jim Kramer noted that if a lead entity requests a phase 2 assessment and it is successful, many more lead entities may bring more phase 2 assessments in for funding. This could result in very high costs to the Board. The Chair suggested saying up-front that the Board will fund experimental phase 2 assessments but to limit the number. Joe Williams suggested integrating this process with other assessment processes around the state rather than overlapping or duplicating the processes.

Director Johnson suggested the Board may want to fund experimental phase 2 assessments through a separate *activities* funding process and focus the third round grant cycle to on-the-ground projects.

Staff will work with state agencies to develop options to bring back to the Board at the June meeting.

New Policy.

Jim Fox suggested the addition of a tenth policy regarding regionalization of funding priorities. This recommendation was due to earlier Board discussion and to be consistent with the Governor's statewide strategy.

Staff will take the guidance received from the Board today along with public comments received and bring the next version of this document to the Board at the June SRFB meeting for adoption.

Topic #8: LEAG Report

Steve Martin presented the LEAG report. The last meeting of the LEAG was held on May 3. His notes reflect comments given SRFB staff, and already incorporated in the third round documents and Board strategy. LEAG appreciates this response to its comments.

By-laws for LEAG – The LEAG has decided to have 3-year membership terms. They will stagger the terms (3 one-year, 3 two-year, and 3 three-year members) and members will be designated in July. They also discussed meeting participation, discussion rules, decision-making levels, and other issues for the by-laws.

Third Round Grant Cycle – LEAG comments have been incorporated into the current version of the application packets. There was some redundancy in questions and the LEAG hopes this will be taken care of. Does not want to have the Board re-prioritize the list. Jeff Breckel clarified the lead entity concern was project selection. In the last grant cycle there was no clear connection between the questions asked and the decisions being made. The leads are still okay with the Board removing projects that are low/low as long as there are clear reasons for the discrepancies. It seems like the changes in this cycle should help to alleviate the concerns.

Cap on assessments – Although it did not reach consensus, the LEAG suggests allowing individual lead entity groups to put their own caps on assessments. Some areas may have large numbers of assessments to get a handle on information; other areas may have very few assessment projects. The Chair commented he doesn't feel the Board can totally delegate this decision to the lead entity groups.

SRFB and Lead Entity Strategy – The LEAG is concerned about using the SRFB strategy to assess the lead entity strategies since many lead entities have already completed their strategy. The Chair mentioned that the SRFB strategy shouldn't conflict with existing lead entity strategies if the Board has correctly stated its.

Lead Entity One-time Support – The LEAG would like to have one source to go to for assistance. Director Johnson reminded the Board that this is the #10 Topic on the agenda.

Watershed Assessment Guidance – The LEAG does not want the Board to adopt this guidance until LEAG has had a chance to review the document. They will probably agree with the document but have not had a chance to review this document as yet.

Topic #9: Third Round Grant Cycle

Debra Wilhelmi and Rollie Geppert presented this information for the Board's information. (See notebook for documents.)

Debra thanked the LEAG for reviewing and commenting on the draft Third Round Application materials. These documents have also been distributed to all lead entities and posted on the web page for comment. Debra reviewed each of the documents with the Board, pointing out changes from the last two grant cycles.

Manual 18 – Policies and Project Selection

Tim Smith asked what kind of money would be in this grant cycle? Debra replied that so far none, since the budget has not passed yet, but we hope to have the state money appropriated by June and then the federal money in October. Hoping for about \$44 million in both state and federal money over the next biennium. Since current law does not allow state agencies to get funds, and the federal money may allow this, the Board will need to discuss this more in the future.

Brenda McMurray asked about what kind of match the Board is getting in the grant cycles? Is it real money, volunteers, in-kind, or what. Debra's response is that the Board is getting match from all different sources. Debra will provide the Board with a brief summary of past match types and amounts.

Ms. Wilhelmi pointed out one big change from the past grant cycles is that each project type will have its own application packet. In the past, all project types have been listed in one application. Applicants would have to pick and choose which part of the application was required for their individual project. Some found this confusing. This year there are eight different applications, one to cover each of the eligible project types. It is a test this grant cycle to see if this is easier for the applicant.

Manual 18a – Lead Entity Application

Steve Meyer pointed out that in the past there was a question on the make-up of the lead entity's technical committee and its citizen committee. He does not see that question asked in this grant cycle. Debra responded: This question was pulled from the list of questions due to comments received from the SRFB technical team. The SRFB technical team did not feel this question helped them in making its decisions.

Discussion was held concerning this issue. The Board decided that they would like to see this question back in the application packet. The answer does not have to go to the technical team, to streamline the amount of information is given to them, but the Board would like it for its use.

Rollie Geppert reviewed the lead entity questions presented in the lead entity application.

The Chair asked about cost-benefit versus cost-effectiveness. No questions were asked about cost-benefit but there is a cost-effectiveness question. The Board needs to have a definition of what cost-benefit is and what cost-effectiveness is.

Discussion was held on cost effectiveness and cost benefit and how to approach this issue. Cost effectiveness is completing the project in the most cost efficient way possible. Director Johnson pointed out that the way the applications are designed causes the applicant to develop cost estimates for the project and breakout all the estimated costs for the project. This gives staff an opportunity to review the application

for cost effectiveness of the project. The Chair wants to make sure all the projects the Board funds are done in the most cost efficient way.

Question was asked about the Land Owner Agreement and is ten years enough? Jim Peters suggested changing to "a minimum of ten years". Rollie reminded the Board that funding only lasts for the first five years and anything over and above that would cost the landowner/project sponsor. Brenda McMurray would like to explore options to increase the time. Board would like staff to bring back options for them to discuss. This also will need to sync up with the monitoring strategy.

Tim Smith stated he doesn't think there are any questions that will encompass community values. There may be a very small, not of high benefit, project that would, if funded, increase community support ten-fold and would increase the number of high benefit projects in the future. Craig Partridge feels that question three captures the community value area. Tim will ask that question of the LEAG.

Staff will make the adjustments to the Third Round application documents and bring the packet back to the Board in June for final adoption and release for the Third Round Grant Cycle.

Topic #10: Lead Entity One-Time Assistance

Jim Kramer and Phil Trask provided the information on this portion of the agenda.

Members discussed what this proposal means to both the Board's funding and the lead entities. They expressed some concern but feel this proposal could be a very good step.

Joe Williams reflected on how Ecology is working this issue and feels this is a great process. He volunteered to help on any committee formed to work through this issue.

After discussion, the Board is not ready to reserve this money at this time but would like to have a more developed proposal brought back before them at a future Board meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: July 19 & 20, 2001 – East Wenatchee
 September 6 & 7, 2001 – Port Angeles
 October 18 & 19, 2001 - Bellingham
 December 6 & 7, 2001 – Tacoma/Puyallup

ACTION ITEM
SRFB RESOLUTION #2001-07

Second Round Conditioning - Implementation

WHEREAS, the SRFB, on the advice of its Technical Panel, requested additions or changes to the proposed scope of certain projects approved for funding as part of the Second Round 2000 grant cycle; and

WHEREAS, funding adjustments are necessary in some cases to achieve the Board's desired objectives in including the conditions in the grant agreements; and

WHEREAS, staff has worked with project sponsors to develop appropriate recommendations for addressing these needs; and

WHEREAS, a subcommittee of the Board has provided oversight of the conditioning process;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board approves funding not to exceed \$ 590,300 for implementing project conditions in the Second Round for the following listed projects, and directs staff to place the conditioned projects under contract.

| Number | | Nearshore & For. Fish Conditions - Project Name | |
|---------|--|---|--|
| 00-1673 | | Island County Nearshore Assessment | |
| 00-1808 | | North Olympic Salmon Coalition - East Jefferson Forage Fish Study | |
| 00-1878 | | San Juan Forage Fish Spawning Hab. Invent. | |
| 00-1873 | | Oakland Bay and Hammersly Nearshore Assmt. | |
| 00-1736 | | Key Peninsula Nearshore Assmt. | |
| 00-1725 | | Bainbridge Nearshore Assmt. | |
| Number | | 'Design' Conditions - Project Name | |
| 00-1898 | | Brooks Slough (Columbia Land Trust) | |

Resolution moved by: ____Brenda McMurray_____

Resolution seconded by: __Larry Cassidy_____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline result)

Date: ____5/23/01_____